1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Because one of XET's members (XS) is a Dutch citizen, XET is also a Dutch citizen.

1	Diversity jurisdiction is destroyed.
2	• XT. The identical analysis just set out applies to XT as well.
3	2. Conclusion. This court lacks subject matter jurisdiction because there is not complete
4	diversity of citizenship between the plaintiffs (including XS) and the defendants XT and XET
5	9both of which are Dutch citizens).
6	
7	DATED: MAY 2, 2008 SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP
8	By: <u>/s/ Christopher Ashworth</u> CHRISTOPHER ASHWORTH
9	CHRISTOTILERASHWORTH
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	SUGGESTION OF PROBABLE ABSENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION 2